

REMARKS

Claims 12-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 12 and 13 are herein canceled. Claims 15, 16, and 18 are herein amended. No new matter has been entered. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated April 26, 2006.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Costello et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0007225). To expedite prosecution and clarify the subject matter of the present invention, Applicants hereby cancel claims 12 and 13 and amend claims 15 and 18 to depend directly and indirectly from allowed claim 14. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claims 15 and 18-20.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference the disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention. Here, *Costello et al.* fails to disclose a parts check list preparing method including the step of “ordering the parts by transmitting the prepared parts check list based on the parts list”. Thus, the rejection is not supported by the cited reference and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner’s assertion that the aforementioned claim feature is disclosed in paragraphs 0026 and 0028 of *Costello et al.* is incorrect. Moreover, even assuming that *Costello et al.* discloses an electronic system of “parts ordering”, it does not do so, for example, by

transmitting a prepared parts check list 360 based on the parts list 352 (that is presented on display together with the layout 350) as disclosed in claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claim 19.

Claim 20, which depends from independent claim 19, should likewise be allowed based on dependency.

Claims 15-18, which depend from allowed claim 14, should likewise be allowed based on dependency.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Costello et al.* as applied to claims 12, 13, 15 and 18-20 above, and further in view of *Rune* (U.S. Patent 6,304,913). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Costello et al.* and *Rune* (U.S. Patent 6,304,913) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of *Gladney et al.* (U.S. Patent 4,714,992). However, claims 16 and 17 depend from allowed claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request, in view of the above remarks, that the Examiner allow claims 16 and 17.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

Application No. 09/842,683
Attorney Docket No. 010589

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Amendment filed: July 25, 2006

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Darrin A. Auito

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,024
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/rf